



"The Primary History of Armenia": An Examination of the Validity of an Immemorially Transmitted Historical Tradition

Author(s): Robert H. Hewson

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *History in Africa*, Vol. 2 (1975), pp. 91-100

Published by: [African Studies Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3171466>

Accessed: 21/01/2013 12:12

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



African Studies Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *History in Africa*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

**THE PRIMARY HISTORY OF ARMENIA:
AN EXAMINATION OF THE VALIDITY
OF AN IMMEMORIALY TRANSMITTED
HISTORICAL TRADITION**

Robert H. Hewson
Glassboro State College

I.

Few peoples of the Middle East have produced as many historical works as the Armenians: their historiography dates back at least to the fifth century A.D. While most medieval Armenian historians have concerned themselves with contemporary history and the immediate past, there have been some who have attempted to trace Armenian history from the earliest times. It is to two of these, Pseudo-Sebeos and Pseudo-Moses of Khoren, that we owe the survival of the body of historical memories now generally referred to as the *Primary History of Armenia*.¹

This *Primary History* has come to us in two redactions, a long and a short.² The shorter version is attributed to the earliest known Armenian historian, Agathangelos (fourth century A.D.?) and is presented in the opening section of a seventh-century work ascribed—probably wrongly—to a certain bishop named Sebeos.³ The longer version, much expanded and edited, is contained in Book One of the compilation of Armenian antiquities known as the *History of Armenia* by Pseudo-Moses of Khoren. While the date of this work has been much disputed, it appears now to be a product of the late eighth or early ninth century.⁴

According to Pseudo-Sebeos the short redaction of the *Primary History* was a work originally written by Agathangelos, secretary to Tiridates III (298-330), the first Christian king of Armenia, and was based on information contained in a book written by a certain Marab the Philosopher from Mtsurn, a town in western Armenia. Pseudo-Moses, on the other hand, claims that the parallel material in his history (I. 9-32 and II. 1-9) is an extract by Marabas Katiba from a Greek translation of a Chaldean history of Armenia made by order of Alexander the Great.

Neither of these claims will bear critical examination.⁵ Not only are the two works not identical, but each was clearly set down by different authors, neither of whom was familiar with the work of the other. Actually, what they represent are two independently written accounts based on parallel versions of the same broad historical tradition—a tradition handed down by one means or another over a period of several centuries.⁶ While in both cases the material supposedly ends with the coming of Alexander the Great in about 330 B.C., it also includes information on sovereigns reigning as late as the second century B.C., that is, some eight hundred years before the date of the version found in Pseudo-Sebeos. On the other hand, the earliest historical personage referred to in the text, Aramu of Urartu, lived in the ninth century B.C., that is, about 1500 years before the time of Pseudo-Sebeos. The exact sources of the various elements contained in the *Primary History* are not important here.⁷ What is of concern in the validity of a historical tradition handed down over so long a period of time before being committed to final written form.

The bulk of the material contained in the *Primary History* consists of a genealogical

sketch of the kings of ancient Armenia from the earliest times down to Alexander the Great. In the short version, set down in the seventh century A.D., this material is simple and straightforward in presentation. In the longer version, produced a century or two later, the material is not only expanded, but somewhat different, and is accompanied by a kind of historical commentary. It is to the question of the nature and validity of the basic data contained in these two versions that this paper is addressed.

The short redaction of the *Primary History* contains the genealogical data shown in Table 1, while the expanded version of the same basic material as preserved by Pseudo-Moses is shown in Table 2. In comparing the data encountered in the two lists we first note that beginning with Hayk there are no more (and perhaps fewer) than fourteen generations in the short list, whereas there are no fewer than fifty-four generations in the longer one. P'arnavaz, for example, is the fourteenth sovereign in the short list while Parnuas, obviously the same personage, is fortieth in the long. Zareh and his son Armog, however, who precede P'arnavaz in the short list and are separated from him by only two generations, succeed Parnuas in the long list by nine generations. In addition to this, two rulers appearing in the short list, Sarhank and Biwrat, are absent from the much longer list of Pseudo-Moses, while there is no mention in the former of any Armenian sovereign ruling at the time of Alexander. Telescoping also is evident in the shorter list: the rule of the Babylonians is followed directly by that of the Medes and no mention is made of the reign of the Assyrians after the Babylonians or of the Persians after the Medes.

II.

Our first step in attempting to ascertain what might be valid in these lists is to determine which, if any, of these kings can be identified from external sources. For this purpose we shall concentrate on the longer redaction of the list as all *identifiable* names are contained therein, while several such names are missing in the shorter version.

Obviously the material from Noah through Thomgarma is totally Biblical and served to link the newly Christianized Armenians to the genealogy of nations contained in Genesis. This attempt shows the influence of Hippolytus of Rome who, in his *Chronicle*, traced the Armenians from Thogarma, a version of their origin followed by most Armenian and Georgian writers.⁸ Even here, however, a grain of truth (or a remarkable coincidence) is revealed when we recall that in Genesis Thogarma represents Til-garimmu, the Assyrian name for an ancient state in east central Anatolia, probably of Phrygian origin, and further recall that Herodotus claimed that the Armenians originally were Phrygian colonists.⁹ As for the remaining names in the longer list, we may single out the following as those on which some light may be shed:

- [1] **Hayk.** The Armenians call themselves Hayk' (sing. Hay), and Hayk is regarded as the eponymous progenitor of their race. Originally a divine figure, under the influence of Christianity he was reduced to "one of the giants" and was made out to be a son of Thogarma.¹⁰ If, indeed, the Armenians were of Phrygian origin, and Til-garimmu, immediately to the west of later Armenia, was a Phrygian formation, then Hayk, son of Thogarma, might well have become a personification of the Armenians as offshoots of Til-garimmu. Beginning here Moses of Khoren appears to be summarizing, albeit in a highly garbled form, the history of ancient Urartu, the memory of which appears to have survived, however vaguely, in the Armenian historical tradition. His description of how the various sons and grandsons of Hayk expanded from their original homeland in Vayots Tzor and Hark', for example, is parallel to the actual conquest of the Armenian plateau by the Urartians moving out from

their center around Lake Van, on the north shore of which lay Hark' and on the south shore Vayots Tzor. Hayk's son Armenak is said to have settled in the plain of Ararat; Armenak's elder grandson, Gegham, along Lake Gegham (now Lake Sevan) further east; Gegham's second son Sisak gave his name to Sisakan (Siwnik'), the region immediately south of the lake; finally, Gegham's son Aram is described as a great conqueror who subjected the entire Armenian plateau to his rule. This account, however streamlined, is a reasonably accurate description of the growth of Urartu as we know it, but it was reduced by the Armenian historical tradition to straightforward genealogical history.

- [2] **Armenak.** Armenak may be connected in some way with Erimena, a late and to date little-known king of Urartu (ca. 625 B.C.). Again, however, Armenak may be purely eponymous in origin, for it is owing to his exploits, we are told by Pseudo-Moses, that the Hayk were called 'Armenians' by other nations.

- [3] **Armais.** He is not known to any outside source but there is a possibility that his name cloaks that of Argisti, one of the two most important Urartian monarchs, and thus that it should be read as **Argais*, an easy spelling error to make in the Armenian script. Argisti I (ca. 786-764 or ca. 780-754 B.C.) was the founder of the city of Argishtihinili, later called Armavir, and Armais is credited in the *Primary History* with being the founder and eponym of this same city. Since Argisti was the first Urartian king to reach Mt. Aragadz on the northern edge of the Ararat plain, it is not unlikely that this mountain was named after him as well. According to Pseudo-Moses Aragadz, however, was named after Armenak which could mean that Armenak/Armais/**Argais*/Argisti were one and the same individual.¹¹

Moses makes Manavaz the younger son of Armenak and a brother of Armais, but he is almost certainly an historical memory of the Urartian ruler Menuas (ca. 810-ca. 786 B.C.).¹² Baz, the son of Manavaz, can be recognized in the Urartian prince Bias, a contemporary of Argisti cited in a Urartian inscription.¹³ Arast, a son of Armais, who is said by Moses to have given his name to the river Arax (Arm., *Yerashk*) is possibly the Urartian prince Erias, another contemporary of Argisti, whose territory seems to have been located in the Ararat plain, precisely along the Arax river.¹⁴

- [5] **Gegham.** He is said to have left Armenia and gone to the shore of a great lake which was thenceforward called Gegh, and to have settled people in a region called after him—Geghak'unik'. Gegham, then, was probably not a person but an eponym—a personification of the lake (now called Sevan) and district of Geghak'uni, whose names are actually derived from *Welikuhi*, the name of this region even before the time of Urartu, which conquered it in the late eighth century B.C.¹⁵ Sisak, brother of [6] Harma and son of Gegham, can only be another eponym, and a late one at that. Sisak is said to have been the ancestor of the princes of Siwnik', a province on the southern border of Geghak'uni. It was called Sisakan by the Sasanids (who ruled Persia from 226 to 637 A.D.); this term was unknown to Armenian historiography before the seventh century A.D. and was first used by a Syrian writer only in the sixth century.¹⁶

- [7] **Aram.** This is certainly Aramu (mid-ninth century B.C.), the first known ruler of Urartu. This identification is based not only on the similarity of names but also on the historical information on Aram provided by Pseudo-Moses which, emphasizing the conquests of Aram and his wars with Assyria, can only refer to the exploits of Aramu. The growing belief that the successors of Aramu were not his descendants

may be the reason that the successors were not known to Pseudo-Moses, his information on Aramu perhaps having been preserved in the family to which he belonged.

- [8] **Ara.** The *Primary History* in both versions makes Ara a son of Aram, although the real Aramu was (so far as we know) succeeded directly by a king named Sarduri I (fl. 834 B.C.). Ara, however, was known to one outside source. Plato in his *Republic* referred to "Er son of Armenius" (or, perhaps, "Er the Armenian") in a context which can only be that of Ara.¹⁷ The fact that Plato—so much closer to the period in question than our Armenian texts—referred to Er's father as Armenius makes it possible to suggest that Er son of Armenius, Ara son of Aram, and perhaps the earlier Armais son of Armenak were variant images of the same person. The *Primary History*'s historical data concerning Ara are very dubious. Although he is considered to have been the contemporary of Semiramis of Assyria (i.e., Sammuamat, 812-803), this queen actually was a contemporary of the important Urartian ruler Menuas (ca. 810-781) and it is more likely that Ara, if he ever existed, has been rendered as an Armenian version of the Asianic deity Arash or Attys, whose legend his story strongly resembles.
- [21] **Shavarsh or Shavash.** A certain Sabaris is mentioned by Xenophon as a son of an Armenian king in the time of Cyrus the Great (559-530 B.C.). See [46] below.
- [26] **Hrant.** This is an Armenian version of the Iranian (Avestan) *aurand/aurvant*, 'mighty' or 'hero,' which was usually rendered into Greek as Orontes. The Orontids were the first independent dynasty of Armenian rulers; other members of this house appear later in the list and will be discussed below.
- [30] **Zarmayr** is said to have played a major role in the Trojan War as an ally of Priam of Troy. No such figure appears in the Greek accounts of this conflict; nor are the Armenians mentioned with it in any connection.
- [37] **Skayordi.** This is not a name at all but an epithet meaning 'son of the giant' or perhaps 'son of the Scyth.' If the latter is the case—and it is very possible—then this could only have been designated as a personal name long after the original meaning of the term *Saka*—Iranian for the Scythians—had been forgotten. It is known that the Scythians invaded the Armenia area in the seventh century B.C. and it is not impossible that in this little-known and confused period between the disappearance of Urartu and the rise of the Orontid kingdom a ruler of Armenia or part of Armenia could have been the son of a Scythian chieftain, perhaps by an Armenian princess.
- [45] **Ervant.** Cited as a contemporary of Darius III (336-330 B.C.), this is another Orontid name and must refer to Orontes II, satrap of Armenia from ca. 344 to ca. 331 B.C.
- [46] **Tigran.** Cited as a contemporary of Cyrus the Great, we are on firmer ground here, for according to Xenophon's historical romance *Cyropaedia* (early fourth century B.C.) there was an ally of Cyrus who had two sons, Tigranes and Sabaris.¹⁸ Now Sabaris is a Greek form of an Armenian rendering of the Persian name usually translated into Greek as Xerxes. Xenophon's use of a Greek form of that Armenian rendering reveals the Armenian source for his data, which further enhances its value for our purpose. It is interesting to note that a king named Shavarsh appears earlier in the list as the great-great-grandfather of Hrant.
- [47] **Vahagn.** Son of Tigran. This is an Armenian version of the Indo-Iranian Vrtrahan or Vērēθragna, a deity identified with the Greek Hercules.¹⁹ Much is made of the exploits of Vahagn by Pseudo-Moses (I. 31; II. 12), and he specifically tells us that he had once been worshipped as a god. This is emphasized in his statement that the

hereditary high priests of Armenia were descended from him. In this memory we have a clear example of the common practice whereby a deity is transformed into an ancestor.

Bagaram-Angegh, found as a king in the short list and as a collateral member of the royal family in the longer one (where he is called Tork'-Angegheay), was another deity reduced to human stature. Angegh-Tork is a syncretism of Tarku, the Anatolian god of vegetation and the proto-Armenian god of the underworld. He is also an equivalent of the Sumerian-Akkadian god Nergal, as is demonstrated by the fact that Angegh is used in the Armenian Bible to translate Nergal wherever that name appears in the original Hebrew (e.g., IV Kings, 17:30).

The Orontid dynasty ruled Armenia from ca. 401 until ca. 200 B.C. It began with two satraps (Orontes I and II) ruling Armenia for the Persians prior to Alexander the Great. Orontes II became king after Alexander's conquest of the Persian empire. Orontes was followed by Mithranes, Orontes III, Samus, Arsames, Xerxes, [Abdissares?], and Orontes IV.²⁰ A certain Artaxias then rose against the Orontids and became master of Armenia proper, while the Orontid Zariadris retained control of the western province of Sophene, threw off the yoke of the Seleucid successors of Alexander in Syria, and established Sophene as a separate state.

Of these Orontid rulers, Orontes IV, overthrown by Artaxias, is remembered by Pseudo-Moses as Eruand overthrown by Artashes, while the same author remembers Zariadris of Sophene, who threw off the Seleucid yoke, as Zareh, who overthrew the Assyrians (read: Syrians). Hrant [26], son of Gorak; Aravan [48], son of Vahagn and grandson of Eruand, and Armog [51], son of Zareh (read: Artok, that is, Artanes, the name given by Strabo to Orontes V, the last Orontid ruler deposed in 95 B.C.) are all probably members of this same dynasty as well.²¹ Note, however, the chronological imbroglio caused by the confusion—frequent in Armenian historiography—between *Asorestan* (Assyria), and *Asorik'* (Syria). As a result the overthrow of Seleucid rule was projected back 400 years and remembered as the overthrow of Assyrian suzerainty.²² Note also that Armenian historical tradition made one continuous dynasty of the kings of Urartu (most of whom, though, remained unknown to that tradition), the Orontids, and the Artaxiads. Still later in the same tradition, but after the list found in the *Primary History*, the Arsacid dynasty is made to follow directly after the Artaxiads, although there was an interval of more than fifty years (and many rulers) between them. Furthermore, the kings of all four dynasties were regarded as belonging to a single royal line springing from Haik and ultimately from Noah.

III.

Thus of the fifty-four kings listed from Haik through Vahe, a bare sixteen can be identified—even fewer with certainty—with known historical figures, or at least linked with events in real Armenian history. On the other hand, there is no mention of any of the other rulers of Urartu (Sarduri, Ishpuina, Menuas, and Rusa) except perhaps, as we have seen, Argisti and Erimena. Nor, we might add, do the names of the chief Urartian deities, Khaldi and Teisheba, appear in the list, although at least two gods of the pagan Armenian pantheon do appear.

The attempt to provide a chronological framework for this kinglist by citing Biblical and other contemporaries for some of the monarchs is patently a fantasy and dates from the Christian period of Armenian history, that is, the fourth century or later. Moreover, the length of the list and the actual length of time separating each of the known

non-Armenian contemporaries as determined by modern historical research, are hopelessly at variance with one another. If Aram, for example, was in fact a contemporary of Abraham (ca. 2000 B.C.) his son Ara could hardly have been a contemporary of the Assyrian Queen Semiramis (812-803 B.C.). Meanwhile some thirty generations separate Ara from Paruyr, a supposed contemporary of Sardanapalus of Assyria (Ashurbanipal, 668-624 B.C.). The length of the list is itself an indication of its spurious character. Allowing thirty years for a generation (which is a good statistical average) the fifty-four generations between Haik and Alexander the Great would place the date of the former at ca. 1957 B.C.²³ The chronological indications in the list, the genealogical linking of one king to another, and the indications of contemporaneity with prominent non-Armenian figures are thus of almost no value. The question which must now be asked is where did the other thirty-eight names come from, and how was this genealogical scaffolding erected?

The answer to both questions lies in the nature of the Armenian state, which, far from being the strong centralized and unified monarchy it was often depicted as being, was in reality a federation of princely states under a relatively weak king who was regarded by the princes simply as a first among equals.²⁴ Consequently many of the monarchs in the genealogy may well represent lists of remembered rulers of separate princely states incorporated by the Armenian historical tradition into a single immemorial royal dynasty. This weaving of many different lists of rulers into one was no doubt aided by the claim of many princely houses to be descended from Hayk, but it is also clear that this synthesis could have been accomplished only relatively late in Armenian history, when many of the Armenian princely houses had died out, and after the monarchy had been extinct long enough for tradition to have endowed it with an exclusivity of sovereignty which no Armenian royal dynasty had ever possessed. Now these conditions were already present in the seventh century A.D., when the Armenian royal houses, once about fifty in number, had been reduced to fewer than thirty, and the Arsacid monarchy had been in 'abeyance' since 428.²⁵

They were much more of a reality, however, in the late eighth century, when Pseudo-Moses is believed to have compiled his work, and we may note that not only is it in his version of the *Primary History* that we find most of our details for the descent of princely houses from scions of the mythical royal house of Hayk, but it is Pseudo-Moses who, long after the extinction of the Arsacids, was the first to endow the Armenian monarchy, ex post facto as it were, with a monopoly of sovereignty it had never possessed. The list of 'kings' was then swollen by the addition of the names of such gods as Vahagn and Angegh who, under the influence of Christianity, were reduced from deities to kings and duly entered into the list. The blending of gods and mortals into one genealogical tree suggests traces of the ancient pagan concept of the descent of kings from gods, as well as the equally typical ancient idea of divine kingship. The genealogy found in the *Primary History* is thus a mythical construction woven with genuine threads of the religion and history of early Armenia. In Toumanoff's words these lists are "a blend of theogonies of the pagan past—divinities become heroes in the Christian monuments—with a pell-mell of reminiscences about the Vannic [i.e., Urartian], Scythian, proto-Armenian, and early Armenian rulers."²⁶

In sum, the kinglist found in the *Primary History* exhibits many signs of artificiality, including excessive lengthening of the past, a total lack of usurpers, dynastic changes and multiple reigns, personification of eras by folk heroes, the arranging of contemporary rulers as successive, and extended father/son succession. To these points may be added such particularities as the confusion of two identically named rulers as one, the possible

confusion of variants of the same name as more than one ruler, and, finally, the introduction of deities into the list in the guise of mere mortals, albeit of heroic dimensions.

One thing is clear from our examination of the long and short Armenian royal genealogies: as history it is too hopelessly muddled to serve by itself for a reconstruction of the history of early Armenia or for the sequence and lives of its rulers. In recognizing the dubious quality of the material in the *Primary History* we may note that the Armenians were not totally preliterate before the invention of the Armenian alphabet in the fifth century A.D. The existence of a proto-Armenian alphabet in the early Christian period is mentioned, some Greek and Latin inscriptions have been found in Armenia, and three royal inscriptions in Aramaic from the time of Artaxias (ca. 200 B.C.) have also been discovered. In addition, the Urartians used the cuneiform system of writing before the establishment of an Armenian state, while Armenia itself was surrounded by literate peoples—Greeks, Persians, Aramaeans, etc.—and had access to their records.²⁷ Yet, for all this, it is clear that their historical tradition is very faulty.

At the same time, however, it is no less clear that, despite the passage of many centuries, some valid, though distorted, recollections of some names and events did persist. Although the Armenian historical tradition, in the genealogical idiom established in the eighth century, is hopelessly defective, we can gain insights from the very nature of the distortions. While the material in the earliest portions of the *Primary History* cannot be regarded and used as factual data, our ability to compare them with what we know of the recorded history of the period and region can be analytically useful, particularly for societies for which such extraneous materials are not available.

NOTES

1. For the only serious discussion of this work in English see Cyril Toumanoff, *Studies in Christian Caucasian History* (Washington, 1963).

2. For the short redaction, translated into French under the title "Le Pseudo-Agathange: histoire ancienne de l'Arménie," see V. Langlois, *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie* (2 vols.: 1869-80), 1:195-200; for the long version, published under the title "Mar Apas Catina: histoire ancienne de l'Arménie," see *ibid.*, pp. 18-53, and also the first book of "Moïse de Chorène," *ibid.*, 2:53-78.

3. G. Abgarian, "Remarques sur l'histoire de Sebeos," *Revue des études arméniennes*, 1 (1964), pp. 203-15, where it is demonstrated that the real author of this work was probably the monk Khosrovik.

4. C. Toumanoff, "On the Date of Pseudo-Moses of Chorene," *Handes Amsorya* (Dec. 1961), pp. 468-76.

5. Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 306-16.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 307.

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 307-9, where the evidence on this question is discussed in detail.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 55n49.

9. Herodotus, *The Persian Wars*, 7.73.

10. Pseudo-Moses (I. 10) referred to Hayk as *i meř skayic'n*, 'one of the giants,' but, after demonstrating that several of the princely houses of Armenia were descended from him, felt obliged (III. 65) to deny that the princes were descended from gods, implying that in pre-Christian times Hayk himself was considered a god. Other traces of his cult as a divinity survived among the Christian Armenians; not only does he appear to have been the subject of religious veneration but he was of astrological

significance as well, for Hayk was the name given by the Armenians to the constellation Orion. See Toumanoff, *Studies*, p. 108n68.

11. Suren Saharuni, "On the Origins of the Armenians," *Armenian Review*, 13 (May 1960), p. 69.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 68.
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Ibid.* For some other aspects of traditional accounts of Armenian origins see E.V. Gulbekian, "The Significance of the Narrative Describing the Traditional Origin of the Armenians," *Le Muséon*, 86 (1973), pp. 365-75.
15. Boris B. Piotrovsky, *The Ancient Civilization of Urartu* (New York, 1969), p. 85.
16. Zacharias the Rhetor, *Ecclesiastical Chronicle* (Eng. tr., London, 1889).
17. Plato, *Republic*, X.13.
18. Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, III, 1, 1:17.
19. Toumanoff, *Studies*, p. 109n168; *idem*, "Caucasia and Byzantium," *Traditio*, 27 (1971), p. 158.
20. For the best discussion of the Orontid dynasty see Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 277-305.
21. Strabo, II. 14, 15.
22. Toumanoff, *Studies*, p. 297.
23. Attempts to assign dates to the kings listed in the *Primary History* have not been wanting. Michael Chamich (Chamchian) in the eighteenth century was the first to address himself to this task, and his dates, adjusted by Saint-Martin, are in Langlois, *Collection*, 2:385. In this effort Hayk is dated to 2107 B.C. These dates were then revised by Jacques de Morgan in his *L'histoire du peuple arménien* (Paris, 1916; English translation, Boston, 1957), p. 401, where Hayk is dated to 2350 B.C., and this has been reproduced with less specific dates by Vahan Kurkjian, *A History of Armenia* (New York, 1958), p. 501. While there may be some excuse for Chamich's efforts, there is none for the two modern works.
24. Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 112ff., 139.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 133.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 108.
27. The confused nature of early Armenian historical traditions is evident even in Book II of Pseudo-Moses' work, which deals with events from the time of Alexander to after the conversion of Armenia to Christianity early in the fourth century A.D. Although this material is much more historical, there is still an astonishing degree of anachronism, confusion, and telescoping. Only in Book III do the data come into reasonably full accord with what we know from contemporaneous sources.

TABLE 1
The Early Rulers of Armenia: The Short Redaction

A	[1]	Haik of the race of Japhet
B	[2]	Armaniak (son of Haik)
C	[3]	Aramais (son of Armaniak)
D	[4]	Amassia (son of Aramais)
E	[5]	Gegham (son of Amassia)
F	[6]	Harma (son of Gegham)
G	[7]	Aram (son of Harma)
H	[8]	Ara (son of Aram and contemporary of Semiramis)
I	[50]	Zareh (a descendant of Zareh; governor under the Assyrians)
J	[51]	Armok (governor under the Assyrians)
K	[—]	Sarhank (governor under the Assyrians)
L	[21?]	Shavash (governor under the Assyrians)
M	[40]	P'arnavaz (contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar)
N	[52]	Bakam (son of P'arnavaz)
O		Biwrat (son of Bakam)

Figures in brackets refer to corresponding names in Table 2. The relationship of J, K, L, and M to I is not stated, but the inference seems to be that they were descended from him.

TABLE 2
The Early Rulers of Armenia: The Long Redaction

[1]	HAIK (son of Thogarma, son of Thiras, son of Gomer, son of Japhet, son of Noah)
[2]	ARMENAK (son of Haik)
[3]	ARMAIS (son of Armenak; his brothers Kadmos, Khor, and Manavaz, and his nephew Baz, son of Manavaz, are also mentioned)
[4]	AMASIA (son of Armais)
[5]	GEGHAM (son of Amasia)
[6]	HARMA (son of Gegham)
[7]	ARAM (son of Harma and contemporary of Abraham)
[8]	ARA (son of Aram and contemporary of Semiramis)
[9]	Ara II (son of Ara I)
[10]	Anushavan (son of Ara II)
[11]	Paret (son of Anushavan)
[12]	Arbak (son of Paret)
[13]	Zavan (son of Arbak and contemporary of Moses)
[14]	P'arnak (son of Zavan)
[15]	Sur (son of P'arnak)
[16]	Havanak (son of Sur)
[17]	Vashtak (son of Havanak)
[18]	Haikak I (son of Vashtak)
[19]	Ampak (son of Haikak I)
[20]	Arnak (son of Ampak)

Table 2 (continued)

- [21] Shavarsh (son of Arnak)
- [22] Norayr (son of Shavarsh)
- [23] Vstak (son of Norayr)
- [24] Kar (son of Vstak)
- [25] Gorak (son of Kar)
- [26] Hrant/Orontes (son of Gorak)
- [27] Entzak (son of Hrant and contemporary of Samson)
- [28] Gghak (son of Entzak)
- [29] Hore (son of Gghak)
- [30] Zarmayr (son of Hore and contemporary of both David and the Trojan War)
- [31] Berj (son of Zarmayr)
- [32] Arbun (son of Berj)
- [33] Bazuk (son of Arbun)
- [34] Hoy (son of Bazuk)
- [35] Husak (son of Hoy)
- [36] Kaypak (son of Husak)
- [37] Skayordi (son of Kaypak)
- [38] Paruyr (son of Skayordi and contemporary of Sardanapalus of Assyria)
- [39] Hrachia (son of Paruyr)
- [40] PARNUAS (son of Hrachia)
- [41] Bajuj (son of Parnuas)
- [42] Karnak (son of Bajuj)
- [43] Pavos (son of Karnak)
- [44] Haikak II (son of Pavos)
- [45] Hrvant/Orontes (son of Haikak II)
- [46] Tigran (son of Hrvant/Orontes and contemporary of Cyrus the Great)
- [47] Vahagn (son of Tigran)
- [48] Aravan (son of Vahagn)
- [49] Nerseh (son of Aravan)
- [50] ZAREH (son of Nerseh)
- [51] ARMOK (son of Zareh)
- [52] BAKAM (son of Armok)
- [53] Van (son of Bakam)
- [54] Vahe (son of Van; killed in battle with Alexander the Great)

Names in caps also appear in Table 1.